

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-29 over Glorikian and Giniger

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317 to Glorikian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,045 to Giniger et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Glorikian and Giniger, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 1-7 and 9-29. As argued during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "the object information including information, the information providing a time duration for construction of the virtual object," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11, 12 and 15-20 (emphasis added). In other words, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests information associated with a virtual object that provides a time duration for construction of the virtual object.

The Office Action acknowledges that Glorikian does not expressly teach or suggest a time duration for construction of a virtual object as recited in independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20. However, the Office Action asserts that Giniger remedies the deficiencies of Glorkian and "clearly teaches providing a user with location-based information, where such information includes perishable information concerning a location, which is known to expire." The Office Action further asserts that "this would at least suggest that such information could be provided with time duration." These assertions are respectfully traversed.

The perishable information of Giniger does not concern a "construction of a virtual object." Giniger merely describes information that is of a perishable nature, such as in the nature of highway traffic conditions, construction and repair progress, and seasonal availability or cost information. Giniger merely discloses the update of information as events

occur, e.g., the changes in traffic conditions, to avoid becoming quickly outdated (Giniger at col. 20, lines 62-65). Giniger updates this information by updating the entries in the selection/position table 201 (Giniger at col. 19, lines 12-15). Accordingly, the information corresponding to a location in the table in Giniger is periodically updated in the table if the information is warranted (Giniger at col. 19, lines 7-19). In other words, Giniger merely updates the outgoing information that corresponds to the position in the table, i.e., current traffic condition. Nowhere does Giniger disclose information regarding a time duration for construction of a virtual object. Thus, for at least these reasons and those argued during the personal interview, Giniger does not teach or suggest a storage device that associates object information related to the spatial information of the virtual object, the object information including a time duration for construction of the virtual object as recited in the independent claims.

Further, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "when it is determined according to the object information stored in the storage device that the positional relationship between the input device and the specified space satisfies a predetermined condition, performing at least one of generation, update and deletion of the at least one of the object information and the service information according to the content of the input performed by the input device," as recited in independent claims 27-29 (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts this feature is inherent. However, nowhere does Glorikian teach or suggest the generation, update or deletion of a virtual object when an input device is within a specified area as in the claimed invention. Glorikian merely performs inputs to a database via a keyboard, for example. Furthermore, this feature is not inherent, i.e., clear that this descriptive matter is present, in Glorikian (see MPEP §2112). Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, reconsideration of this alleged "inherent" feature is respectfully requested.

Thus, for at least these reasons and those argued during the personal interview, independent claims 1, 11, 12, 15-20 and 27-29 are patentable over Glorikian and Giniger. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-26, which variously depend from the independent claims, are also patentable over Glorikian and Giniger for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for they additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 8 Over Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of Giniger and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,918 to Stewart. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claim 8. Stewart does not remedy the deficiencies of Glorikian and Giniger discussed above with respect to claim independent 1. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 27-29 Over Glorkian and Pierkarski

The Office Action rejects claims 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of "Tinmith Metro: New Outdoor Techniques for Creating City Models with an Augmented Reality Wearable Computer," to Pierkarski et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Piekarski does not constitute prior art. Pierkarski was published in 2001. However, Piekarski relates to the IEEE 2001 Conference, which met from October 8, 2001-October 9, 2001. The present application claims priority to No. 2001-034349 filed February 9, 2001 in Japan and No. 2002-004941 filed January 11,

2002 in Japan. Enclosed are accurate English-language translations of the priority documents.

Because the priority documents fully support the claims, as agreed during the personal interview, Piekarski does not constitute prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: February 20, 2007

Attachments:

Accurate English-Language Translation of JP 2001-034349
Accurate English-Language Translation of JP 2002-004941

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
